

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

T. Terell Bryan, # 254638, <i>aka Terence</i>)	
<i>Bryan, aka Terence Terell Bryan</i>)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No. 4:10-27-TLW-TER
)	
)	
Hampton County Clerk of Court, Mylinda)	
D. Nettles; Honorable G. Nettles;)	
Assistant Deputy General, Salley W.)	
Elliott,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

ORDER

Petitioner, T. Terell Bryan, (“petitioner”), brought this civil action, *pro se*, on January 7, 2010. (Doc. #1).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this case had previously been assigned. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court dismiss the Complaint without prejudice and without issuance and service of process for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (Doc. # 10). The petitioner filed an objection to the report. (Doc. # 12). In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections...The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are

addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections. After careful review of the Report and objections thereto, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Report. (Doc. # 10). Therefore, for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Complaint is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. Additionally, the Petitioner's motion for a two-month extension of time and for a change of venue is **DENIED**. (Doc. # 13). Finally, Petitioner's motion for recusal of the magistrate judge is **DENIED**. (Doc. # 15).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

July 21, 2010
Florence, South Carolina